



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Paper No.

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS TX 75380

COPY MAILED

MAR 25 2008

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
John Andrew Dankovich et al.
Application No. 10/675,670
Filed: September 30, 2003
Attorney Docket No.:
AUS920030647US1
Title: HETEROGENOUS DOMAIN-
BASED ROUTING MECHANISM FOR
USER AUTHENTICATION

:
:
: DECISION ON PETITION
: PURSUANT TO
: 37 C.F.R. § 1.181
:
:
:
:

This is a decision on the petition filed February 20, 2008, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.181, requesting that the holding of abandonment in the above-identified application be withdrawn.

BACKGROUND

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply within the meaning of 37 C.F.R § 1.113 in a timely manner to the final Office action mailed July 26, 2007, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three months. No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 C.F.R § 1.136(a) were obtained, and no responses were received. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on October 27, 2007.

RELEVANT PORTION OF THE M.P.E.P.

M.P.E.P. § 711.03(c) sets forth, in pertinent part:

PETITION TO WITHDRAW HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT BASED ON FAILURE TO RECEIVE OFFICE ACTION

In *Delgar v. Schulyer*, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), the court decided that the Office should mail a new Notice of Allowance in view of the evidence presented in support of the contention that the applicant's representative did not receive the original Notice of Allowance. Under the reasoning of *Delgar*, an allegation that an Office action was never received may be considered in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. If adequately supported, the Office may grant the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment and remail the Office action. That is, the reasoning of *Delgar* is applicable regardless of whether an application is held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee (35 U.S.C. 151) or for failure to prosecute (35 U.S.C. 133).

To minimize costs and burdens to practitioners and the Office, the Office has modified the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner stating that the Office communication was not received by the practitioner and attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office communication was not received. A copy of the docket record where the nonreceived Office communication would have been entered had it been received and docketed must be attached to and referenced in practitioner's statement (emphasis added). For example, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. See Notice entitled "Withdrawing the Holding of Abandonment When Office Actions Are Not Received," 1156 O.G. 53 (November 16, 1993).

The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office action was lost in the mail (e.g., if the practitioner has a history of not receiving Office actions).

Evidence of nonreceipt of an Office communication or action (e.g., Notice of Abandonment or an advisory action) other than that action to which reply was required to avoid abandonment would not warrant withdrawal of the holding of abandonment. Abandonment takes place by operation of law for failure to reply to an Office action or timely pay the issue fee, not by operation of the mailing of a Notice of Abandonment. See *Lorenz v. Finkl*, 333 F.2d 885, 889-90, 142 USPQ 26, 29-30 (CCPA 1964); *Krahn v. Commissioner*, 15 USPQ2d 1823, 1824 (E.D. Va 1990); *In re Application of Fischer*, 6 USPQ2d 1573, 1574 (Comm'r Pat. 1988).

Two additional procedures are available for reviving an application that has become abandoned due to a failure to reply to an Office Action: (1) a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) based upon unavoidable delay; and (2) a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) based on unintentional delay.

ANALYSIS

Regarding the search, Petitioner has set forth that both the file jacket and the docket records have been searched. This statement is being construed to mean that Petitioner personally conducted this search, and as such, is in possession of firsthand knowledge of the facts to which he has set forth.

Petitioner must notify the Office if this is not a correct interpretation of the statement contained in this petition.

With this petition, Petitioner has alleged that the mailing was not received, has set forth that he has searched both the file jacket and the docket records, and has included copies of the latter.

CONCLUSION

Considering the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue, as set forth on petition, it is concluded that Petitioner has met his burden of establishing that the mailing was not received.

Accordingly, the petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.181(a) is **GRANTED**. The holding of abandonment is **WITHDRAWN**.

The Notice of Appeal filed concurrently with this petition on February 20, 2008, has been entered and made of record. Accordingly, **the two-month period for filing the Appeal Brief accompanied by the fee required by law, runs from the mailing date of this decision.**

The Technology Center will be notified of this decision. The Technology Center's support staff will notify the Examiner of this decision, so that the present application can receive further processing in due course.

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225¹. All other inquiries concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

/Paul Shanoski/
Paul Shanoski
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

¹ Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for any further action(s) of Petitioner.